SHOUT
SHARE
IT

THE

BOTANICAL EXCHANGE CLUB

OF THE BRITISH ISLES.

REPORT FOR 1884.

Manchester:
PRINTED BY JAMES COLLINS & CO., KING STREET.
1885.

THE BOTANICAL EXCHANGE CLUB OF THE BRITISH ISLES.

REPORT OF THE DISTRIBUTOR FOR 1884.

By ARTHUR BENNETT, *F.L.S.*

In this Report on the plants gathered in 1884, I cannot help expressing the great regret that the members must feel (myself even more than any other member), as we lose the valuable aid for the first time of Dr. Boswell, whose state of health has precluded me from troubling him with any specimens. If those members who possess the full series of the present, and of the Thirsk Club Reports, will look back and see how much those Reports are indebted to and enriched by Dr. Boswell's notes, they will see how much, personally, I feel their absence from this one.

With these remarks, it only remains for me so say that the thanks of the members are due to Dr. Almquist, of Stockholm; Prof. Babington, Mr. J. G. Baker, Mr. Beeby, Mr. T. Archer Briggs, Dr. Buchanau, of Bremen; Dr. Focke, of Bremen; Messrs. Groves; Prof. Hackel, of St. Poelton; and the Rev. J. E. Leefe, for their notes and observations on the plants submitted to them.

The total number of plants received for distribution was about 4,371, from 27 contributors.

	Counted as Specimens.
Mr. J. E. Bagnall, *A.L.S.*	104
Mr. Charles Bailey, *F.L.S.*	354
Dr. R. L. Baker	87
Mr. W. H. Beeby	238
Mr. Arthur Bennett, *F.L.S.*	178
Mr. H. Bromwich	172
Mr. W. H. Brown	122
Mr. J. Cunnack	10
Mr. G. C. Druce, *F.L.S.*	138
Rev. H. E. Fox, *M.A.*	104
Dr. John Fraser, *M.A.*	69
Mr. J. E. Griffith, *F.L.S.*	209
Mr. J. Groves	113
Mr. F. J. Hanbury, *F.L.S.*	234
Rev. A. Ley, *M.A.*	318
Rev. E. F. Linton, *M.A.*	420
Rev. W. R. Linton, *M.A.*	533
Mrs. E. A. Lomax	119
Mr. J. Cosmo Melvill, *F.L.S.*	33
Mr. A. Fryer	341
Mr. H. H. Johnston, *M.B.*	20
Mr. G. Nicholson	30
Rev. W. Hunt Painter	70
Rev. W. H. Purchas	28
Rev. W. Moyle Rogers, *F.L.S.*	17
Mr. G. Webster	129
Mr. J. W. White	181
	4,371

Members will kindly correct the labels according to this Report.

July, 1885. ARTHUR BENNETT.

Thalictrum flavum, L., var. *sphærocarpum*. Blackwater, Surrey, 30th August, 1884. The achenes are, as usual, attacked by some gall insect. The perfect fruits, which can only be detected by cutting sections, seem to belong to this variety.—W. H. Beeby.

Thalictrum flavum, L., var. *Morisonii*. Clifton Ings, near York, July, 1884.—G. Webster. "Simply a galled state."—J. G. Baker.

Ranunculus Lingua, L. Northumberland. Becoming rare, and likely to be extinct.—H. E. Fox. The notes on the probable cause of the extinction of any species are always valuable, and I would suggest to the members that any facts that they could put on record respecting this subject would hereafter be of great value. In the Journal of the Linnean Society—"Botany," No. 136, 1885—Mr. F. C. S. Roper calls attention to the "early submerged leaves" of this species, and mentions that they are rarely alluded to by authors. Some further details will be found in M. Crépin's 'Notes sur quelques plantes rares ou critiques de la Belgique,' Fas. 5, p. 17, 1865. We know so little of the life history of aquatic and semi-aquatic plants that it is always desirable to call attention to any notes on them.

Ranunculus auricomus, L. var. *incisifolius*, Reich. Ic. Lane near Ockley, Surrey, on the weald clay, 14th April, 1884. I have not seen this form, which agrees well with Reichenbach's plate both in the larger flowers and greatly cut bracts, except in the above station. On the chalk the bracts are sometimes somewhat bluntly lobed, but not cut as in the present plant.—W. H. Beeby.

Caltha minor. August 13th, 1884. What I am now sending from Glen Callater, Aberdeen, approaches *radicans* more closely even than what I sent last year, having triangular toothing of the leaves besides rooting at the nodes; the shape of the leaf is not exactly "deltoid."—E. F. Linton. "I think that these specimens of *Caltha* are *palustris*, *minor*."—C. C. Babington.

Fumaria confusa. Cambridgeshire.—A. Fryer. 26th June, 1884. "Of the *Fumariæ capreolatæ* segregates, I understand and can clearly distinguish only *F. pallidiflora*, Jord., and *F. confusa*, Jord. Of course Mr. Fryer's plant is not the former. *F. Borœi* I do not understand, nor *F. muralis*, Sonder."—T. R. Archer Briggs. I called this *confusa* for Mr. Fryer and I still think it so.

Fumaria confusa, Jord. Fields near the village, Holy Island, Cheviotland. New to county. See Baker's Flora, and Topl. Botany.—H. E. Fox.

Fumaria densiflora, DC. With *confusa* in Holy Island; only recorded station in two northern counties.—H. E. Fox.

Cochlearia anglica, L. To illustrate the divergence believed to exist between the Bristol plant and the type.—J. W. White.

Thlaspi perfoliatum, L. Stony ground near Charlbury, Oxon., April, 1884. Sent in order to show that it still exists in Oxfordshire, for which county it is queried in Topl. Botany. It occured in many thousands in the above locality, which is about 8 miles from the Binford locality mentioned in Sibthorp and other authors.—G. C. Druce. This is a very interesting re-discovery of a very local plant.

Viola Curtisii? Sandhills, Ross Links, Cheviotland. Only two or three large plants, not hitherto recorded from E. Coast.—H. E. Fox. "Yes."—J. G. Baker.

Viola tricolor, var. May, 1884. Occurred in chalky cornfields near Stokenchurch, Oxon.; and was also seen near Loudwater, Bucks. —G. C. DRUCE.

Drosera obovata, M. & K. Sligachan, Skye, July 31st, 1884. At a certain point up the River Sligachan the hybrid intermediate was almost the commonest form in boggy margins of pools; *D. anglica* being also frequent, *D. rotundifolia* rather scarce. We saw no well developed capsules of *D. obovata;* and blackened decaying petals (?) covered up what capsule there was.—E. F. and W. R. LINTON. "Very good *obovata.*"—J. G. Baker.

Cerastium pumilum, Curt. From W. Gloucester and N. Somerset, which latter may be a new record.—J. W. WHITE. "Of the three specimens on the sheet, with the one label, I would so name the side and smaller specimens only; the larger one being, in my opinion, *C. semidecandrum*, L."—T. R. Archer Briggs. Mr. Briggs is certainly right, the specimens are mixed on many of the sheets.

Alsine hybrida, 'Vill.' Lakenheath, W. Suffolk.—G. C. DRUCE. Is *A. laxa*, Jord. 3rd edition of Eng. Botany; the plant under the name of *hybrida* in Eng. Botany is much more glandular, the calyx quite broad at the base, and the capsule shorter.

Spergularia neglecta, Syme?? Forms sent for correction.—H. E. Fox. "These scraps are unsatisfactory to determine. I suspect them to belong to a maritime form of *S. rubra*, and to be wrongly named *S. neglecta.*"—T. R. Archer Briggs.

Claytonia alsinoides, Sims. Spreading rapidly on garden walks, &c., at North Shields, probably introduced in ship's ballast.—W. H. BROWN.

Hypericum dubium. Hedge Court, Surrey, 14th Sept., 1884. To confirm new county record. J. of Bot., 1884, p. 300.—W. H. BEEBY.

Althæa officinalis, L. One large plant near the wood, about a mile from Charthill, perhaps escaped; not recorded for Northumberland.—H. E. Fox. Probably an escape; I twice found it in that state in the South.

Radiola millegrana, Sm. Ross Links. Not recorded in Baker and Tait's Flora, "Cheviotland" Top. Bot.—H. E. Fox.

Melilotus arvensis, Wallr. A casual, but not hitherto recorded, from Northumberland.—H. E. Fox.

Trifolium procumbens, L. Abnormal form, with foliaceous calyces. —H. E. Fox.

Sanguisorba officinalis, L. Blackwater, Surrey, 30th Aug. 1884. To confirm new county record. J. of Bot., 1884, p. 300.—W. H. BEEBY.

Poterium stenolophum, Jord. Bristol, Gloucestershire. The plant so named by Dr. Boswell in 1883.—J. W. WHITE.

Potentilla reptans, L., *flora pleno.* Everywhere on banks on the Gault formation on the lower road, Undercliffe, Folkestone, towards Sandgate, the flowers being all more or less double, though some were more so than others.—J. COSMO MELVILL.

Rubus hemistemon. Willenhall, 5th July, 1884.—J. E. BAGNALL. "Hardly my plant; is it a small form of *suberectus?*"—C. C. Babington. "I should have hesitated between *fissus*, Lindl., and a small form of

suberectus, Ands., with an inclination towards the latter determination. I fail to understand *hemistemon*, of which Mr. Bagnall has favoured me with specimens."—T. R. Archer Briggs. "Seems right."—J. G. Baker.

Rubus hemistemon. Warwick, 8th July, 1884.—J. BAGNALL. "*Hemistemon*, var. staminib. longioribus."—Dr. Focke.

R. affinis, W. et N. Harrow Weald Common, 1883.—EYRE DE CRESPIGNY. "*R. geniculatus*, Kaltenb."—Dr. Focke. This is placed by Nyman under *pubescens*, Wh., and Focke's *geniculatus* is referred to *carpinifolius*, Wh.

Rubus Lindleianus, Lees. Putney, Surrey.—EYRE DE CRESPIGNY. "Yes."—Dr. Focke.

Rubus imbricatus, Hort. Hole in the Wall, Sept., 1884.—W. H. PURCHAS. "Yes."—C. C. Babington.

Rubus leucostachys, Smith. Putney Heath, Surrey, 1883.—EYRE DE CRESPIGNY. "Near *R. conspicuos*, P. J. Muell."—Dr. Focke.

R. Salteri. Hone Hill, Hereford, 8th Sept., 1884.—A. LEY. "I think this is *carpinifolius*. I do not remember having seen *Salteri* with such a panicle, or its leaves with such teeth."—C. C. Babington. "*R. rhombifolius*, Wh., or very near it."—Dr. Focke. A sub-sp. of *villicaulis*. *R. vulgaris*, var. d. *rhombifolius*, W. et N. Rubi Ger., p. 38-40. *R. carpinifolius*, var. b. *roseus*, W. et N. Rubi Ger., p. 36.

Rubus villicaulis. Woods near Witney, Hereford, 15th Oct., 1884. A. LEY. "Yes."—C. C. Babington. "*R. silvaticus*, W. and N. Rubi Germ., p. 41, 1825."—Dr. Focke.

Rubus Salteri? Bab., *calvatus?* Putney Heath, Surrey, 1883. EYRE DE CRESPIGNY. "*R. villicaulis*, Koch. var."—Dr. Focke.

Rubus adscitus. Llanberis—J. E. GRIFFITH. "Imperfect."—C. C. Babington. "Incomplete specimen"—Dr. Focke.

R. tuberculatus, approaching *corylifolius*. Bullingham, 2nd Oct., 1884.—A. LEY. "No; *pampinosus*, Lees."—C. C. Babington.

Rubus Borreri, Bab. Earl Wood, Warwick, 9th Aug., 1884.—J. BAGNALL. Mr. Briggs makes the same note under this as the "Atherstone Outwoods" specimens, and also to those from "Berkwell's Warwick, 16th Aug., 1884.—J. Bagnall."

Rubus Sprengelii, Weihe. Hampstead Heath, Middlesex, 1883. EYRE DE CRESPIGNY. "Yes."—Dr. Focke.

Rubus Sprengelii, Borreri. Berkwell Woods, 16th Aug., 1884.—J. E. BAGNALL. "*Borreri*."—C. C Babington.

Rubus Borreri. Atherstone Outwoods, Warwick, 4th August, 1884.—J. E. BAGNALL. "Certainly under agg. *Sprengelii*, W., of Babington, and I suppose sufficiently large and luxuriant to be considered the var. a. *Borreri* rather than the restricted *Sprengelii* constituting var. b."—T. R. Archer Briggs. "*R. Sprengelii*."—Dr. Focke.

Rubus Borreri. Quamford, 22nd August, 1884.—W. H. PURCHAS. "Scarcely separable from true *Sprengelii*.—C. C. Babington. "*R. Sprengelii*."—Dr. Focke.

Rubus Hystrix. Hampstead Heath, Middlesex, 1883—EYRE DE CRESPIGNY. "Yes."—Dr. Focke. This is not given for "Brit." by Nyman, but seems to be well understood enough by our Bramble Students. I have gathered it in Surrey quite coinciding with the specimens determined by Dr. Focke.

Rubus Lejeunii. Putney Heath, Surrey, 1883.—EYRE DE CRESPIGNY. "*R. rosaceus*, Weihe and N."—Dr. Focke.

Rubus Radula. Perivale, Middlesex, 1883.—EYRE DE CRESPIGNY. "Yes."—Dr. Focke.

Rubus rudis, Wh. Somerset, 6th June, 1884.—J. W. WHITE. "*R. echinatus*, Lindl., not *rudis* of W. and N."—Dr. Focke. Nyman gives *echinatus* as a var. of *R. radula*, Wh., with "Brit." only "*R. rudis*, Bab., sec. Focke," as a synonym, and places *R. Leightoni*, Lees, under *R. rudis*, Wh. and N.

Rubus Kœhleri, verus. Kington, Hereford, 27th August, 1884.—A. LEY. "This is essentially the same as a Devon and Cornwall bramble which I have noticed for some years past; though the Rev. A. Ley's specimens are more prickly. It is not what I regard as typical, being, as I think, as near var. *infestus*. At present I know no better arrangement than to place it as a form or var. of aggregate *Kœhleri* of Babington's Manual. The light hue of the leaflets beneath and their formal outline are noticeable features."—T. R. Archer Briggs. "Yes."—Dr. Focke.

Rubus Kœhleri, pallidus. Highgate Woods, Middlesex, 1884. EYRE DE CRESPIGNY. "*R. Kœhleri*, not *pallidus*, Wh."—Dr. Focke.

Rubus infestus. St. Weonards, Hereford, 30th Aug., 1884.—A. LEY. "I think is *pallidus*."—C. C. Babington. "*R. Kœhleri*, W. and N., not *infestus*, Wh."—Dr. Focke.

R. Kœhleri, verus. Park Wood, Hereford, 27th Aug., 1884.—A. LEY. "This, I think, is *infestus*."—Dr. Focke.

Rubus cavatifolius. Trellack, Hereford.—A. LEY. "Yes."—C. C. Babington. "I do not know *cavatifolius*."—J. G. Baker. "Near *R. fuscus*, W. & N. and *R. mutabilis*, Genev."—Dr. Focke.

Rubus pyramidalis, Bab. Great Doward, Hereford, 28th Aug., 1884.—A. LEY. "May do for *pyramidalis*."—J. G. Baker. "Very weak and uncharacteristic *pyramidalis*."—C. C. Babington.

R. pyramidalis, Bab. Llanberis, July, 1884.—J. E. GRIFFITH. "Much better *pyramidalis* than the Hereford."—C. C. Babington. "The panicles here are clearly two of *pyramidalis*, but the barren shoot is, I believe, some other species."—T. R. Archer Briggs. "*R. longithyrsiger*, Lees, *pyramidalis*, Bab."—Dr. Focke. See "Babington Journal of Botany," 1878, p. 177, for Lees' name, although he does not adopt it in the 8th edition of the Manual.

Rubus Purchasii, Blox. "Unknown to me."—Dr. Focke. See Babington, Journal of Botany, 1878, p. 208. I can find no mention of this in the 8th edition of the Manual.

Rubus corylifolius, var. Acomb, York, July, 1884.—G. WEBSTER. "*Sublustris* with very coarsely dentate leaves."—C. C. Babington. "*Corylifolius*, var.? Sepals erect."—Dr. Focke.

Rubus corylifolius, conjungens. St. Weonards, Hereford, 12th Aug., 1884.—A. LEY. "*Conjungens* = *Balfourianus*."—C. C. Babington. "*R. corylifolius*, Smith."—Dr. Focke.

Rubus corylifolius, conjungens. Uig, Skye, 6th Aug., 1884.—E. F. LINTON. "*Conjungens* = *tuberculatus* = *scabrus*, Müll, Genevier."—C. C. Babington.

Rubus corylifolius, Sm. Hulme End, Alstonfield, August, 1884.—

W. H. PURCHAS. "May be glabrous *R. corylifolius*."—C. C. Babington. "Approximates to *cæsius*."—J. G. Baker.

Rubus corylifolius, purpureus. St. Weonards, Ross, 11th August, 1884.—A. LEY. "*Corylifolius, purpureus*, is really a much coloured state of *sublustris*."—C. C. Babington. "I think a corylifolian form, and may do for *purpureus*, of which I have no clear idea."—T. R. Archer Briggs.

Rubus tuberculatus. Acomb, York, August, 1884.—G. WEBSTER. "*Tuberculatus*, I think it is, but not a good specimen."—C. C. Babington.

Rubus cæsius, umbrosus. Tram Inn, Hereford, 30th July, 1884. A. LEY. "I believe it to be the *ligerinus*, Genev., which does not well find a place under my *agrestis*. Its prickles are much more numerous and remarkable, and its terminal leaflet differs at the base, &c."—C. C. Babington. "*R. cæsius*, L."—Dr. Focke.

R. althæifolius. S. Weonards, Hereford, 12th Aug., 1884.—A. LEY. "*cæsius*, var. d. *intermedius*, not exactly typical."—C. C. Babington. "*R. nemoralis*, Aresch." This is a sub-species of *corylifolius*, Smith. It occurs in Sweden (Strane Lodmelund. Bohulsän) and Norway—Areschoug in Blytt's "Norges Flora," p. 1168, who quotes "Fries Herb. Norm.," fas. 4, No. 47, for it. It is not named in Focke's Synopsis.

R. cæsius, pseudo-Idæus. "*Serpens?* of the 'Manual' = *hispidus* of the 'British Rubi.'"—C. C. Babington. "Hybrid of *R. cæsius*, but not with *Idæus*."—C. C. Babington.

Rosa alpina, var. c. *pyrenaica*, Gouan. A single large bush in Croxdale Woods, within a quarter of a mile of the Home (near Durham), but not apparently planted.—H. E. Fox. This was named by Mr. G. Nicholson, and can only be from a garden.

Rosa mollissima, Willd. Strome Ferry, W. Ross, 30th July, 1884. The leaves are almost glabrous. Mr. Baker remarks on it: "Likely a *mollissima* form, but I never saw it with so little hair before." The two bushes noticed were 4-5 feet high, and in respect of habit had rather the appearance of *mollissima* than *tomentosa*, Sm.—E. F. and W. R. LINTON.

Rosa tomentosa, Sm., var. *farinosa.* Kimbolton, Herefordshire, 25th July, 1884.—A. LEY. Passed by Mr. J. G. Baker.

Rosa Andrzeiowskii, Besser, teste Déséglise. Near Scarborough, Yorkshire, September, 1884.—G. WEBSTER.

Rosa rubiginosa, comosa. Sprowston, Norfolk E., 2nd July, 1884. E. F. LINTON. "Mr. Baker regards the British *R. rubiginosa* as agreeing best with *R. comosa*, Ripart, 'Review British Roses,' p. 18."

Rosa rubiginosa, echinocarpa. Drayton, Norfolk, 17th Sept., 1884. E. F. LINTON. "I believe this might pass for a form of *rubiginosa* without further remark."—T. R. Archer Briggs.

Rosa rubiginosa, echinocarpa. Sprowston, Norfolk, E., 2nd July, 1884.—E. F. LINTON. "A striking plant, seemingly nearest *rubiginosa* of our British species. Some plants we are accustomed to place under *R. tomentosa* diverge quite as much from the type as does this from ordinary *rubiginosa*. I do not know anything of *echinocarpa*."—T. R. Archer Briggs.

Rosa micrantha, Briggsii. 15th July, 1883.—J. W. White. "*R. micrantha*, Sm., var. *pedunculo-nudo*, of which *Briggsii*, Baker, is only a luxuriant form. I find this variety of *micrantha* growing spontaneously in some of the hedges very near the house where I write this." T. R. Archer Briggs. "Two years ago I sent to the Club fruiting specimens of this rose, which had been determined by Mr. Briggs himself. Other botanists, however, considered it to be a form of *R. sepium*, and wished for examples in flower by which to settle the question. These are now supplied."—J. W. White. "*R. sepium*, var."—J. G. Baker.

Rosa sepium. Buckden, Hunts, 5th Sept., 1884—W. R. Linton. "This Rose, with its very short peduncules, differs slightly from the next *(micrantha*, v. *pedunculo-nudo).* It cannot be the typical *R. sepium* of Thuillier's 'Fl. des Env. de Paris,' which work I know, and the description of *R. sepium* has 'fructibus oblongo-ovatis.'"—T. R. Archer Briggs. Passed by Mr. J. G. Baker. This, as Mr. Briggs rightly remarks, has not the fruit of the original *sepium*, but it seems best placed under it; it is less different than a curious form that occurs in Surrey, which M. Crépin seems inclined to refer to a rare Continental species, but which has all the essential general characters and growth of *sepium.* Herr von Uechtritz, to whom I sent Surrey examples of this form, considered it represented Thuillier's "*sepium*, *inodora*, Fr." but I cannot agree with him in either reference, but at present I know not what name to give these Surrey specimens.

Rosa canina, L., var. *frondosa.* Buckden, Hunts, 4th Sept., 1884. W. R. Linton. Passed by Mr. J. G. Baker.

Rosa canina, pruinosa. Glen Shee, Perth, 1st Sept., 1884.—E. F. Linton, "Similar to a plant so named sent out through the Club last year. Seems correctly named."—T. R. Archer Briggs. Passed by Mr. J. G. Baker.

Rosa canina, L., var. *arvatica.* Ellington, Hunts, 9th Sept., 1884. W. R. Linton. "Is *tomentella.*"—J. G. Baker.

R. canina, *andegavensis.* Hereford, 16th July, 1884.—A. Ley. "I suppose *andegavensis*, which has sometimes, at least, serratures of the leaflets irregularly cut and petioles hairy, thus not differing from *lutetiana* beyond having aciculate peduncules."—T. R. Archer Briggs.

Rosa canina, L., var. *andevagensis*, Bark. Ellington, Hunts, 9th Sept., 1884.—W. R. Linton. Bromsgrove, Worcester, 26th June, 1884.—E. F. Linton. Saint Weonards, Herefordshire, 19th July, 1884.—A. Ley. All passed by Mr. J. G. Baker.

Callitriche verna, L. Pinner, Middlesex. 2nd June, 1884.—W. R. Linton. The deciduous character of the styles, and smallness of the fruit are in favour of *vernalis*, Kutz. The sinus of the fruit, on the other hand, is rather deep, and the lobes are slightly winged. It therefore, seems intermediate between *vernalis*, Kutz., and *stagnalis*, Scop. It was growing in some inches depth of water in a ditch.—W. R. Linton. "I see what seems to be a wing to the fruit of this specimen."—C. C. Babington.

Callitriche pedunculata. Surrey, 28th June, 1884.—W. R. Linton. "Not a species, only (as I believe) *hamulata* on mud."—C. C. Babington. "Were the fruits here only peduncled, I should

endorse the name given by the collector of the specimens. Any how I do not know what else to call them."—T. R. Archer Briggs. I have seen and gathered *pedunculata*, with sub-sessile fruit, and with peduncules ¾ inches long; I do not think there is any reliance to be placed on this character. I have also gathered it in water a foot deep, with both states of fruiting.

Galium, form approaching *G. aristatum*, Sm.—J. Cunnack, July, 1884. Goonhilly Down, Helston. "A poor specimen of a *Mollugo* form."—J. G. Baker.

Carduus tenuiflorus, Curt. Hamborough, Northumberland, Aug. 1884. — H. E. Fox. "*Pycnocephalus* = *C. tenuiflorus*, Curtis."—J. G. Baker.

Arctium nemorosum? Bournemouth.—Elizabeth Lomax. "An unsatisfactory specimen, probably *A. intermedium.*"—C. C. Babington. "Seems not to have the 'ovate' heads of Babington's description. It is often impossible to me to name positively *Arctia* from a dried specimen. Of the one in question I can only say certainly not *A. majus*, nor typical *minus (eu-minus*, Syme*)*."—T. R. Archer Briggs.

Artemisia vulgaris, L., *v. coarctata*, Fors. Near Howdon-on-Tyne, Northumberland.—W. H. Brown. Professor Babington writes, "many thanks for this," hence I judge he considers it correctly named.

Senecio palustris. East Norfolk, June, 1884.—F. J. Hanbury. Mr. Hanbury sends a large number of this rare species; unfortunately immediately after gathering them, he had to leave London, and so the drying is not so satisfactory as he could have wished. He tells me the plant was in great abundance, much more so than when I pointed out the station to him in 1883. It is very satisfactory to find this rare Btitish plant "holding its own" so well, as, besides the above station, I know of two others in Norfolk and one in Suffolk.

Solidago virgo-aurea, L., *angustifolia*, E.B., 3 ed. Skye, 7th Aug., 1884.—W. R. Linton. "Judging from Boswell's description in E.B. 3 ed. of var. b., I do not think this represents it well. There seems little to distinguish *genuina* and it."—T. R. Archer Briggs.

Tragopogon pratensis, L., c. *grandiflorus* Railway bank, Leek Wootton, Warwickshire, July, 1884.—H. Bromwich. Mr. Baker made no remark on this—I doubt it being anything more than *pratensis* type.

Lactuca virosa, L. Cromer, Norfolk, July, 1884. I send two or three specimens with leaves runcinate and cut like those of *S. scariola.* E. F. Linton. On the Norfolk coast *virosa* is very fine, near Holkham. I have seen it forming dense masses, and forming quite a feature by the roadside.

Sonchus oleraceus, L., glandular.—H. Bromwich. I suppose correct for the form spoken of by Boswell under *S. oleraceus* (but not designated by him a variety) as rarely with glandular hairs on the underside of the leaves and peduncles."—T. R. Archer Briggs.

Sonchus asper, glandular, Sept., 1884.—H. Bromwich. "New to me."—C. C. Babington.

For a fine series of specimens of *Hieracia*, the members are indebted to the Messrs. Linton, whose collections of these plants in 1883 and 1884, are probably as interesting as any gathered for many years.

Mr. Backhouse asks that any one in gathering *Hieracia*, will kindly note "the colour of the styles (on the labels), when gathering in the fresh state."

Hieracium melanocephalum, Tausch. Corrie Etchachan, S. Aberdeen. W. R. LINTON. "Form of *H. chrysanthum*."—J. Backhouse.

Hieracium nigrescens, Willd. Carn Chreay, Killin, Perth, 21st Aug., 1883.—W. R. LINTON. "I think *pallidum*."—J. Backhouse.

Hieracium gothicum, Fr. On a dark shale bank, head of Instrope, Weardale, Durham, Aug., 1884.—W. H. BROWN. Poor specimens, which Mr. Backhouse rightly declines to name; they are, however, only a form of *vulgatum*.

Hieracium corymbosum, Fries. Braemar, S. Aberdeenshire, 15th Aug., 1883.—W. R. LINTON. "Rather *H. strictum* of my monograph."—J. Backhouse.

Hieracium corymbosum, Fr. Braemar, S. Aberdeenshire, 14th Aug., 1883.—W. R. LINTON. "*H. strictum*, Fr."—J. Backhouse.

Pyrola media, Swartz. Wood at Witley, Surrey. W. H. BROWN. Is *P. minor* L.

Veronica officinalis, L. Grayswood, Surrey, 1st June, 1884. Form with pink flowers.—W. H. BEEBY.

Euphrasia officinalis, L. forms. August, 1884.—E. F. LINTON. From three districts in N.W. Scotland. The point of difference from type is in the length of the capsule, which exceeds the calyx considerably. All were gathered in maritime localities. One is from W. Ross for which *E. officinalis* is not hitherto recorded.—E. F. Linton.

Mentha sylvestris, L. var. *mollissima*. River side, Great Doward, Herefordshire, 25th August, 1884.—AUGUSTIN LEY. "Certainly not *mollissima*."—J. G. Baker.

Mentha piperita, Huds. Occurred in a deep ditch on the border of North Leigh Heath, Oxon., for which county it is a new record. July-September, 1884.—G. C. DRUCE.

Mentha gentilis, L? In a mill pond at Easington, near Belford. Not recorded for Northumberland previously.—H. E. FOX.

Anchusa officinalis, L. Railway bank, Hartlepool. Perhaps introduced with ballast. Not reported from Durham previously.—H. E. Fox.

Centunculus minimus, L. Ross Links, Northumberland (Cheviotland). New to the county—H. E. Fox.

Plantago major, L A dwarf form, produced doubtless by the dry summer and poor soil of the sandhills.— H. E. Fox.

Chenopodium rubrum, L., b. *pseudo-botryoides*. Ross Links. Is this the maritime form mentioned in Baker and Tait's "Flora," p. 237? H. E. Fox.

Atriplex triangularis, Willd. E. Norfolk.—E. F. and W. R. LINTON. "Is, I believe, a state of *hastata*, not of *deltoidea*. Seems to be what I once called *prostrata*"—C. C. Babington.

Rumex maritimus, L. A casual, but not recorded for Northumberland.—H. E. Fox.

Rumex elongatus, Gus. Tintern, Monmouthshire, 6th Aug., 1884. A. LEY. "I do not think this is *elongatus*. A fine state of *crispus*." C. C. Babington. "May do for *elongatus*."—J. G. Baker. I see

nothing of *elongatus* in this, that is in approaching the plant of Gussone.

Ulmus nitida. Hereford, 1884.—A Ley. "I do not know what *U. nitida* is."—C. C. Babington.

Quercus intermedia, Don. Hereford, July, 1884.—A. Ley. "It may be *intermedia*."—C. C. Babington. "Perhaps so, but I should have had some doubt."—J. G. Baker.

Salix rubra, Huds. c. *Helix*. Halton, Warwick, April-September, 1884.—H. Bromwich. "Anther large, filament so far as I can see, but one and this undivided. In *S. rubra*, Huds., the filament is often divided quite half-way down. Scarcely *rubra*, but I do not like to speak positively."—Rev. J. E. Leefe.

Salix Smithiana, var. *pseudo-stipularis*. Little Doward, Hereford, May and August, 1884.—A. Ley. "No resemblance to *S. stipularis*, Sm. I think it is *viminalis* var. *stipularis*. The stipules are often absent in *S. viminalis*."—Rev. J. E. Leefe.

Salix ferruginea. Turvey, Bedfordshire, 24th April, 1884.—W. R. Linton. "A form, I think, of *S. ferruginea*, but not *S. ferruginea* of E. Bot., nor *S. ferruginea*, Anders., which has styles so short that Dr. Lindley referred it to *S. cinerea*."—Rev. J. E. Leefe.

Salix nigricans, var. *petræa*, Borr. Glen Callater, Aberdeen, S., 13th August, 1884.—W. R. Linton. "A good deal like it. Catkin longer than the floral leaves, style cloven, stigmas divided, ovarium smooth, but I do not observe that it is wrinkled upwards, which is characteristic of *petræa*, and there are no stipules, which in *petræa* are often large."—Rev. J. E. Leefe.

Salix repens, L. Berrow, Somerset, April-May, 1884.—J. W. White. "Yes; as an aggregate."—Rev. J. E. Leefe.

Salix repens, L. Probably the form *argentea*. Somerset coast. J. W. White.

Salix Lapponum, L., *arenaria*. Canlochan, Forfar, 3rd Aug., 1884.—W. R. Linton. "I think so."—Rev. J. E. Leefe.

Salix Arbuscula, c. *venulosa*. Killin, Perth, Lochan-na-lai, 17th Aug., 1884.—W. R. Linton. "Possibly *venulosa*, Forbes. Venation peculiar, veins prominent above."—Rev. J. E. Leefe.

Salix ? Glen Callater, Aberdeen, S., 13th Aug., 1884.—E. F. Linton. Among the Alpine Salices, I send two from Glen Callater, which I fail to name. One is apparently a *S. nigricans* form, from the Water-break-neck falls. The other has the leaves something like *S. Lapponum*, L., but broader and much rounded at the base; this was from the head of the glen, and no fruit was found. —E. F. Linton. I have little doubt that Mr. Linton is right in referring the specimens to the species he does, the material was not sufficient to do more.

Sparganium affine, Schneiz. Braemar, Aberdeenshire, 6th Aug., 1883. —W. R. Linton. "I should certainly accept this name."—W. H. Beeby.

Sparganium affine, Schneiz. Peaty pool, between Uig and Quirang, Skye, 5th Aug., 1884.—W. R. Linton. "I believe it to be a northern form of *S. simplex*, which is often labelled *affine*. This last has unfortunately no anthers left, but the fruit is that of *simplex*. —W. H. Beeby. "*Sparganium affine*, probably."—C. C. Babington.

Sparganium affine, Schneiz. Glen Canlochan, Forfar, 18th Aug., 1884. Found in a minature tarn, at an elevation of about 2,700ft. or more; growing in some quantity, without any sign of flower or fruit. The naming therefore rests on probability. Specimens of *S. affine* in good fruit, were also gathered by us near Uig, Skye, a fortnight previously, making an addition to the flora of V. C. 104.—E. F. and W. R. LINTON. "I cannot name this without flowers or fruit, but from the texture of the leaves, should incline to *simplex*."—W. H. Beeby.

Sparganium minimum, Fr. Newham Lough, Northumberland. Not recorded in Top. Botany for the county, but see Baker and Tait, pp. 267, 268 (in Fl. of North. and Durham).—H. E. Fox. "I have some doubts of this."—W. H. Beeby.

Potamogeton fluitans, Roth. Mr. FRYER sends a single specimen from some pits in the neighbourhood of Ramsey, Hunts (Co. 31), accompanied by a living specimen; this up to date (June, 1885,) shows no signs of flowering with me, but seems quite identical with specimens growing with it from the Loire, France (M. J. Lloyd of Nantes). This is a plant that has often been reported as British, and as often contradicted, forms of *polygonifolius*, *rufescens*, and *Zizii* having been mistaken for it. There seems no reason to doubt Mr. Fryer's specimens being the true plant, they agree well with specimens in the Berlin Herbarium determined by Nolte and Chamisso, and with others in my own collection from the herbarium of the late Al. Braun.* I am in hopes that Mr. Fryer's specimens will fruit with him this year, when its identity will be made quite certain. Indeed, the observations of my acute friend almost make me feel sure; i.e., "its habit of growth is quite different from *P. natans*, which grows in the same pit; of that, roots come up freely, of this, the roots strike deep into the mud. All the submerged leaves are alike, down to the very bottom, linear-lanceolate. I can see its distinctiveness from deep water forms of *polygonifolius* better now I have had a second look at it growing." There is one thing Mr. Fryer's specimens show, i.e., that the non-branching of *natans*, *fluitans*, and *polygonifolius* has exceptions, and in this I am supported by the opinion of my friend, Rev. T. Morony, of Mass., U.S.A., who writes that "while the rule here, there are exceptions." I give a few synonyms and its points of difference from *natans*, &c., preferring, however to do this, to a merely technical description, as that conveys little information to our field-botanists; of course in Floras this would be out of place, but in our Report it seems to me we want this sort of matter rather than dry details.

Potamogeton fluitans, Roth., in "Fl. Germ." 1, p. 72, 2, p. 202, not of Hooker, Lon., Smith! De C.! Besser! Michx.! *Potamogeton natans*, b. *fluviatilis*, Schlecht Fl. Berol! ex sp. in Herb. Berlin! *Potamogeton natans*, b. *fluitans*, Cham., in Ad. Fl. Berol, p. 4! *Potamogeton natans*, c. *angustatus*, M. et. K., 1 p. 838. From the usual state of *natans* it differs in the upper leaves, being gradually tapered into the petiole, the midrib of much thicker consistence, the

* For these I am indebted to the kindness of Dr. Eichler, Director of the Königl. Bot. Museum at Berlin, and its courteous custodian, Dr. Schumann.

stipules blunter, *the submerged leaves having laciniæ*, the fruits smaller and more rounded. The submerged leaves, especially the young ones, are of very thin texture. From all states of *polygonifolius* it differs at once by the *thick peduncles*, larger flowers, and larger fruit. The forms it is liable to be mistaken for are—Of *natans:* The var. *prolixus*, of Fr. (*P. serotinus*, Schrad.); and of *polygonifolius*, the var. *pseudo-fluitans*, of Syme. The question of the phyllodia of *P. natans* I have not yet been enabled to trace by growing specimens, but in specimens of a form of *polygonifolius*, watched for five years (from N. Wales—J. E. Griffith), I find the laminæ to drop off, leaving the petioles, which become nearly white, but in this state are persistent to October and November. The leaves of this form assume a very *natans*-like look, much like the specimens from "Fleet Pond, N. Hants," in Mr. H. C. Watson's herbarium at Kew. It is this form of *polygonifolius* that is often named *natans!* When in fruit, however, there is no difficulty. The distribution of *P. fluitans*, Roth., is not yet worked out, the barren specimens in various herbaria being extremely difficult to separate from some others. My herbarium contains the true plant from Prussia, Italy, Denmark, France, Siberia, Algeria, Socotra, and the Argentine Republic. I have seen specimens in various herbaria from Switzerland, Austria, Portugal (Herb. Berlin), Arabia, Persia, Abyssinia, Morocco, and other countries. I have had living specimens under my eye for the last four years, kindly sent by M. J. Lloyd, of Nantes, and I am inclined (on present knowledge) to agree with those Continental authors who separate it from *natans* and *polygonifolius*, but I should wish to see *natans* grown by their side before expressing a decided opinion; this I hope to do. While writing this notice, a specimen of a *Potamogeton* comes from Ireland (R. M. Barrington), which is not *sparganifolius* or *polygonifolius*, and is either the *P. natans*, v. *prolixus*, or *P. fluitans*, Roth., but the specimen is too young and not sufficient for determination. I hope to obtain it later on. It may be the *fluitans*, var. *rivularis*, Lange, of which I possess specimens from the author. I hope any botanist who visits Ireland this autumn will pay special attention to its aquatic plants.

Potamogeton natans, L. (seg.) Canal, near Bath, N. Somerset, V.C. 6th August, 1884.—W. B. Waterfall, com., A. Bennett. Additional record of V. C.

Potamogeton polygonifolius, Pour., var. b. *pseudo-fluitans*. Margin of Llyn an-afon, S. of Llanfair-fechan, N.E. Carnarvonshire, 29th Sept., 1884.—Charles Bailey. Not *pseudo-fluitans* of Syme; I think it must come under *natans*, and is near to var. *prolixus*, Koch, resembling a specimen I have from Silesia (Herr von Uechtritz), with a note "assentiente cel Nolte." There is a fine form of *polygonifolius* that occurs in this Lake (August, 1883.—J. E. Griffith and W. W. Reeves) with large thin leaves, and stipules highly colored. A plant similar in habit to Mr. Bailey's, but with the leaves and stipules of *polygonifolius*, occurs in Llyn-y-galasr (alt. 1,500 ft.), in Cardiganshire, —Mr. E. Straker! and shows clearly that Mr. Bailey's plant belongs to *natans*. In a notice of the Student's Flora, 3 ed., in "The Naturalist," for October, 1884, the reviewer considers "*polygonifolius*, Pour., to bear a somewhat similar relation to *natans* that *Zizii* does to

lucens." This is generalising upon insufficient knowledge, and want of access to large series of the plants named. There is never any occasion to doubt as to which to refer a specimen to (*natans* or *polygonifolius*) from any part of the world, if in fruit, and *polygonifolius* retains its characters equally from deep water! as from shallow; on this compare the remarks by Hooker and Arnott, British Flora, 8 ed., p. 484, the last paragraph, and Crépin "Notes sur quelques plantes rares ou critiques de la Belgique," fas. 1, p. 23. As to *lucens* and *Zizii*, I fear the reviewer would be puzzled with the series in my own collection, as to where *lucens*, *Zizii*, *heterophyllus*, and *nitens* ended and began.

Potamogeton plantagineus, Du Croz. Between Acle and Halvergate, by Yarmouth, E. Norfolk, June, 1884.—ARTHUR BENNETT. New station for the species, which is quite rare in the country on present records.

Potamogeton decipiens, Nolte. (sub.-sp.) Canal, near Alford, below Guildford, Surrey, 26th Aug., 1884.—ARTHUR BENNETT. In 1883, Mr. Beeby brought a scrap from the canal which was thought might be *decipiens*, and in August last he kindly showed me the station, when all doubt about it ceased; it occurs among *P. lucens* and *P. crispus*. This is made a sub-species of *lucens* in "The Students' Flora," 3 ed., (by me); some curious facts have been communicated to me by Mr. Fryer with respect to its relations to *lucens* and *Zizii*, but they are not yet worked out; and I hope he will endeavour to study them this summer. Ascherson "Flora of Brandenburg" considers it a hybrid between *prælongus* × *lucens*? Hartman's "Handbok i Skand. Flora," 11 ed., while retaining Nolte's name suggests the same; while Marsson "Flora v. Neu-vorpommern und Rügen" suggests *lucens* × *perfoliatus*. Nolte does not notice the plant in his "Nov. Flor. Holsaticæ," not having then met with it I suppose. As to its being a hybrid I can only say there is no trace of *prælongus* in the canal, though *perfoliatus* may be there, but I did not notice it. Dr. Tiselius in an able paper in the "Botaniska Notiser," contends that *decipiens*, Nolte, *salicifolius*, Wolfgang, *Upsalensis*, Tiselius, and *nitens*, Weber, are referable to one aggregate species.

Potamogeton Zizii, M. et K. Cambridgeshire.—A. FRYER. A large number of good specimens of this debatable plant. In the "Bulletin de la Société Linnéenne de Normandie," 1885, (for this I am indebted to Mr. Charles Bailey's kindness), M. Corbière contends that *P. Zizii* is a distinct species from *heterophyllus* and *lucens*, using his own words he says—"En un mot, je crois que le *Potamogeton Zizii* est une espèce de valeur égale à celle de *P. rufescens*, par exemple, et plus ou moins affine, dans le cycle assez restreint des formes où elle se meut, aux *Pot. heterophyllus*, Schreb., *rufescens*, Schrad, et *lucens*, L." The reference to *P rufescens* is remarkable, and (for while it certainly is the case that British botanists have referred *Zizii* to *rufescens*, and M. Corbière elsewhere in his "Note" seems to imply some affinity with *rufescens*,) still two species more distinct could scarcely be found, their mode of growth, habit, and especially fruit are totally unlike one another. Were it not for forestalling the memoir of my friend, Dr. Tiselius, I should like to "break a lance" with M. Corbière on the

subject. I must, however, say this that I think M. Corbière is decidedly wrong in his conclusions, and believe them to be founded on insufficient materials.

Potamogeton Zizii, M. & K. Hedge Court mill pond, Surrey, 18th August, 1884. With the ordinary state of this I send some of the aerial leaves formed when the plant is left stranded by the receding water, as occurs with *heterophyllus*. No true floating leaves were seen this year.—W. H. Beeby.

Potamogeton Griffithii, A. Bennett. Lake, Llyn-an-afon, Carnarvonshire.—J. E. Griffith. Several specimens of this plant. I have had this growing with *prælongus* and *rufescens* for three years; its growth is much slower than either, and it does not die down during the winter, the upper part only rotting away. By this means I have assured myself that it is not *prælongus*; at no stage of its growth, from the first leaves to the flowering stage, can it be mistaken for *prælongus*, on careful examination of its structure (leaves, stem, &c.). I hope to succeed in getting my specimens to fruit this year.

Potamogeton zosterifolius, Schum. Shropshire.—E. Beckwith, com. Arthur Bennett. An interesting addition to the Salopian Flora; but in the Herbarium of Trinity College, Dublin (in sheet 45*), there is a specimen of this with the note "Shropshire, Mr. Borrer." Mr. C. Bailey sends a large supply of excellent specimens from the Cromford Canal, Derbyshire.

Potamogeton panormitanus, Biv. Ditch, near the sea in Wolverton Parish, W. Norfolk, July, 1884. "It had the habit and very much the appearance of *Scirpus fluitans*."—G. C. Druce. I should have named this *pusillus*, f., it does not agree with my authentic example of Bivoni's plant.

Zannichellia repens, Boeningh. *Vide* Reichenbach's Icones, Tab. 766 (p. 23), No. 1,003. "Radicans, filamento germina vix superante, stigmatibus repandis nuculis, subsessilibus lævibus vel dorso multicrenulatis," Reich. ap. Moesl. et Fl. Germ. Exc. p. 6. In a shallow stream running from Witney Common towards Witney, by the roadside to North Leigh, Oxon, July, 1884.—G. C. Druce.

Zannichellia ? species In the tepid water of the canal, Reddish, near Manchester, 24th June, 1884. The same plant as was distributed last year under the name of *Z. repens*, Boenningh. See page 96 of Report for 1883.—Charles Bailey. "It seems somewhat different from all my club *Zannichelliæ*, though I think nearest *polycarpa*, Nolte." — T. R. Archer Briggs. "Is it *Zannichellia polycarpa?* But hardly. Is it an exotic plant?"—Prof. Babington. "*Z. palustris*."—Dr. Buchanau, Bremen. I cannot agree with Dr. Buchanau, unless he would mean a *very* aggregate species, but I can get no reliable information on this plant; no two opinions agree, except Mr. Briggs and Prof. Babington. For the present it must remain without a name.

Liparis Loeselii. Cambridgeshire.—A. Fryer. Norfolk.—F. J. Hanbury and Arth. Bennett. I had the pleasure, last June and July, of accompanying the rediscoverer of this interesting inhabitant of the Fens. In Norfolk the plant occurred in great profusion, in many cases as many as 6-10 in a clump, accompanied by a plentiful growth

of *Carex paradoxa*, and much more rarely by a small form of *C. stricta*. The water level was much lower in 1883-84 than it had been for some years, otherwise the approach to the plant would have been not an easy matter. In Cambridgeshire it was much less plentiful, and scattered over a larger extent of ground. In Suffolk it was gathered in 1883-84, by the Rev. Dr. Hind (to whom I am indebted for specimens). It is somewhat remarkable that after an interval of over twenty years the *Liparis* should be found so plentifully, although it has occurred for several years past in one of its old Cambridgeshire stations but very sparingly. There are some very interesting remarks on this plant and its structure in M. Crépin's "Notes sur quelques plantes rares ou critiques de la Belgique," fas. 5, p. 102-104, 1865, a work that will be found well worth study by British botanists, but which I do not remember to have seen quoted except under *Carex ornithopoda* by Dr. Trimen and Dr. Boswell.

Epipactis violacea, Bor. Mr. Beeby sends two specimens of an *Epipactis* from Surrey, named as above. Mr. Baker could express no opinion on it, and I am not prepared to accept or deny the name. The recent note on this genus in the "Journal of Botany" (July, 1885), by the Rev. W. Purchas, I am very glad to see, and if there is any one who will take up the genus I shall be glad to place at their disposal my series of European forms, gathered together for the express purpose of a study of the genus. We may expect some additions to our knowledge of the northern species in the forthcoming new editions of Hartman's "Scandinavian Flora" and Lange's "Handbook of the Danish Flora."

Corallorhiza innata, Br. New to the southern side of the Border. Abundant in a boggy wood on the borders of Cheviotland, 1884. H. E. Fox. A very interesting addition to the English Flora, and a species that seems to have a decided northern tendency in Europe; in its southern distribution it is montane, unless it be in the swamps of Swabia and Lithuania.

Juncus nigritellus, Don. Wet sand, near Wells, Norfolk, 8th September, 1884.—E. F. and W. R. Linton. The plants from Wells do not quite agree with a specimen so named, gathered by Mr. C. Bailey on the coast of Merioneth, but are about identical with a specimen from Mr. Boswell Syme from Scotland. It is interesting to have a new locality for a variety of which the "Student's Flora" states nothing satisfactory is known. "*J. lamprocarpus* fructibus nigro-fuscis."—Dr. Buchanau. "*J. lamprocarpus* v. *nigritellus*, Don." —Dr. J. Lange.

Juncus Kochii. Cut Mill, (near Godalming,) Surrey, July, 1883. In this *Juncus* I noticed particularly that the filaments are of equal length with the anthers, and not "nearly twice as long," as stated in Babington's Manual, ed. 8.—W. R. Linton.

Schœnus nigricans, L. Bagshot Heath, Surrey, 4th Aug., 1884. A few specimens from this county.—W. H. Beeby.

Rhyncospora alba, Vahl., v. *sordida.* Bog, Trelleck, Monmouthshire, 6th Aug., 1884.—A. Ley "I see only ordinary *alba* in this." —J. G. Baker. "Yes."—Prof. Babington. I agree with Mr. Baker, the specimens do not agree with continental examples of *sordida*.

Scirpus uniglumis. Skye.—Messrs. LINTON. "*Eleocharis uniglumis*, I believe."—Prof. Babington. "I fancy this is *palustris*, and not *S. uniglumis.* I have found *palustris* vary extremely in size. The stalks and sheaths lead me to think it *palustris.* It may be the specimens are mixed, but all I have examined I should have named *uniglumis*, and Mr. Baker passed a specimen without comment.

Scirpus pauciflorus, Lightf. Bisley Common, Surrey, 22nd June, 1884, To confirm new county record. Journ. of Bot. 1884, p. 300. W. H. BEEBY.

Carex dioica, L. Bisley Common, Surrey, 18th May and 22nd June, 1884. To confirm new county record. Journ. of Bot., 1884, p. 300. The female plant sent (No. 133) is a very tall form, and grew a long way from any male plants; perhaps a sterile state.—W. H. BEEBY.

Carex ligerica, Gay. Of this variety of *arenaria*, I have contributed some cultivated specimens (France—M. J. Lloyd) from my garden, in the absence of a supply of British specimens.—ARTHUR BENNETT.

Carex Schreberi. I have also sent a few cultivated specimens of this *Carex* from my garden, originally from M. J. Lloyd, of Nantes, but it grows much less quickly than *ligerica*, which threatens to overrun everything in its neighbourhood. This should occur in our west, south, or east coast counties.

Carex teretiuscula var. A good supply of this variety cultivated (good fruit) by Mr. Bagnall. Is not *Carex diandra*, Roth., 1788, the same as Goodenough's plant? If so, it claims precedence by six years.

Carex pseudo-divulsa. Godalming, Surrey, 29th May, 1884.—W. R. LINTON. In these specimens I see only *divulsa*, certainly they are not the same as a plant that does grow near Godalming, and which I pointed out to Mr. H. C. Watson, and in which he concurred in giving the name of *pseudo-divulsa* to. "I would label this *divulsa*, Good." T. R. Archer Briggs.

Carex lagopina, Wahl. Ben McDhui, Aberdeen, S., Aug. 14, 1884. A number of plants, forming fairly dense little clumps, at an elevation of 3,800ft., slightly higher than the Lochnagar station. A peculiar feature of these plants was that the spikelets were most of them broken off, from some unknown cause, though not mature, hence the specimens are rather poor. Near the same spot was a good quantity of *Aira alpina.*—E. F. LINTON. An additional station for an interesting species. Since writing this, I find there is a record of this.

Carex alpina, Swartz. A nice series of this *Carex*, and which several botanists have failed to find in its recorded stations before 1884. Glen Phee, Clova, Forfar, July 20, 1884.—Messrs. LINTON.

Carex trinervis, Degland. Mr. J. G. BAKER sends a supply of this *Carex* for distribution, which will make it familiar to many. It should be searched for on any of our sandy coasts, and once gathered cannot be passed over for anything else.

Carex Goodenoughii, Gay, v. *juncella*, Fries. Hedge, Court Mill Pond, Surrey, June, 1884. In 1883 Mr. W. H. Beeby brought from this locality a series of interesting *Carices*, and in 1884 he kindly accompanied me to the neighbourhood and pointed them out to me growing. We gathered two forms of the above, one exactly

matching an original specimen in Boott's Herbarium of Wahlenberg's. *C. aquatilis*, v. *nardifolia* (1803) in Vet. Acad. handl. This is an interesting form of the variety; but, taking the British specimens I have seen and the fine series in Dr. Almquist's herbarium, I can see only a variety of *Goodenoughii (vulgaris)* and not a sub-species, as it is made by Nyman.

Carex salina, Wg. fl. lapp. *C. cuspidata*, Wg. et *C. salina*, Wg. i Vet. Ak. handl. 1803*, b. *kattegatensis* (Fr., ind. sem. hort. ups., 1857, sp.) Almquist in Hartman's Handbok i Skan. Flora, ed. 11 (1879). Banks of the Wick river, near Wick, Caithness.—JAMES GRANT. Mr. Grant having sent specimens for the Exchange Club, but unfortunately too late to be included in the distribution, it is only fair to him that a notice of the plant should appear in our Report; the specimens will be sent out with the 1885 plants. This most interest addition to our Flora is an instance how easily a 'good thing' may be passed over; I think it may be instructive to give its history, as a hint to any botanist not to accept any thing at sight. In Aug., 1884, Mr. Grant sent me a specimen labelled "*C. riparia?*;" at this time one is usually full of botanical matter with little spare time, I simply glanced at the glumes, and wrote to Mr. Grant "rather *paludosa* v. *Kochiana*," put the specimen with others, for examination in the winter. In December, when looking through my *Carices* (principally to take out Surrey stations for Mr. Beeby's forthcoming "Flora of Surrey"), I saw at once this was not *paludosa*, and after examination could only refer it to *salina*, but where under this section to place it I could not see, and any one who had to name *salina* forms, will understand my difficulty. I took it to Kew, showing the specimen to Prof. Oliver and Mr. Baker, but as neither of these gentlemen would say "it was *salina*," or "was not," I felt dubious of my own determination, and on my return home again examined it still with the full certainty of its being a *salina* form. To put the name at rest, I sent it at once to Dr. Almquist (author of the "Distigmaticæ" section of the genus in Hartman's "Hand. i Skan. Flora," he returned it with the note, "the *Carex* sent is *C. salina* v. *kattegatensis*, Fr." This may seem out of place, but I really believe we pass over many things, or accept them on trust, that a closer investigation would show were worth recording. On sending a note of its discovery to Prof. Babington, he wrote "who gathered the *Carex salina* in Caithness? It is a county well deserving of careful examination, having in view the "Flora of Scandinavia." This is what I have repeatedly urged on Scottish botanists, and I fully believe there are at least a dozen Scandinavian species that will eventually be found in Scotland. *C. salina* is an extremely variable species, Nyman makes three species of it, with three sub-species, and numerous varieties; I would go further and make one species, putting the others as sub-species. An examination of authentic specimens of nearly all the species described, from Drs. Almquist, Blytt, Lange, and Herr Nilsson, seem to me to show so gradual a passage from one to the other, as to be impossible to assign some specimens names.

* This is usually quoted as Acta Holm., but any one who had to consult catalogues would be puzzled to find it.

Carex salina (Wg.), as an aggregate species occurs in Iceland! Spitzbergen! Lapland! the Faroes, Norway! Sweden! Nova Zembla, British America! British Columbia! United States! Greenland! and probably eleswhere, but I have not yet been enabled to specially "look up" its stations. Of our species it comes nearest to *C. aquatilis*, Wg., var. *Watsoni*, Syme., but differs in being a much more robust plant, with *paludosa*-like foliage, the glumes of the female spikes aristate, and very rough, three-neved, and the whole plant dries a peculiar yellowish green colour, at once recognisable by the eye once seen. Taking the European distribution of *salina*, one of its stations is Goteburg in Sweden, about one degree further south than Wick, and I am prepared to hear of its discovery at the estuaries of some of the rivers that fall into the Moray Firth, where its associates are recorded, *i.e.*, *Juncus balticus* and *Carex incurva*.

Carex fulva, Good. Rahoy and Sunart, Argyleshire, 11th Aug., 1884.—W. R. Linton. Mr. Linton sent me this in the autumn named "*C. distans*." I suggested it rather came under *fulva*, as an aggregate. Mr. Beeby suggests *C. xanthocarpa*, Degland, in which I think he is probably correct, but I have not seen a type specimen of Degland's plant, and in *Carices* I should decline to name any specimen decisively until I had.

Carex fulva, Good. Bisley Common, Surrey, 22nd June, 1884, and Bagshot Heath, Surrey, 4th Aug., 1884. To confirm new county record, "Journ. of Bot.," 1884, p. 300.—W. H. Beeby.

Carex flava, L., v. *minor*. Seckley Wood, Arley, Staffordshire, 7th July, 1884.—J. Fraser. "The type, I believe."—J. G. Baker. "I call this *C. flava*, L., var. *lepidocarpa*, Tausch. I do not understand the new arrangement of the *flava* and *Œderi* forms."—T. R. Archer Briggs. This is certainly *C. flava*, *genuina*, and not *minor*, or the true *lepidocarpa*, Tausch.

Carex Œderi, Ehrh? = *C. lepidocarpa* of "Top. Bot.," H. C. W. Not recorded previously for the county. Ross Links, Northumberland (Cheviotland, v.c.)—H. E. Fox. Mr. Beeby suggests perhaps it is "*flava-minor*." I think it is rightly named.

Carex ampullacea × *vesicaria*. Skye, 4th Aug., 1884.—W. R. Linton. "*C. vesicaria*, I suppose."—C. C. Babington.

Agrostis ? Wimblington Firelots, Cambridgeshire, 1884. A. Fryer. "Somewhat abnormal *A. canina*, L., the culms are partly decumbent and rooting on the lower joints, from them spring up capillary leaves, as it is in all species of *Agrostis* when branches come from the culm-nodes. *A. canina*, L., seems very disposed to this manner of growth, if circumstances favour it. I do not believe it worth making a proper variety, because it depends on local influences." Prof. E. Hackel in litt.

Agrostis alba. Broadfoot, Skye, 30th July, 1884.—W. R. Linton. "Is *A. alba*, b. *subrepens*, Bab. Manual; perhaps also the *A. stolonifera* b. *arenaria*, L., Sp. pl. ed. 2 (*A. alba stolonifera*, Sm.). I cannot assert the synonymy of Linneus (because the Swedish work is not at hand where described), but I take Babington's name as the best until the question of Linneus' plant shall be settled."—Prof. E. Hackel in litt.

Kœleria cristata. Sea sands.—J. W. White. Varying much as this grass does, both inland and on the coast, I have not yet seen anything that can be certainly referred to the *albescens* of De Candolle, and in this Mr. G. Nicholson concurs, he having had the opportunity of seeing the types of the plant.

Psamma baltica. Sandhills, Ross Links, Northumberland (Cheviotland).—W. H. Brown. Very few specimens of this are contributed, and it still remains a desideratum with many members.

Festuca "glauca." Uig, Skye, 6th Aug., 1884.—E. F. Linton. "Is a form of *F. rubra*, L., which is not specially described in my Monograph Fest. europ. It comes nearest to *F. rubra*, sub-v. *juncea* (Mon. p. 139), but differs by its very glaucous leaves, this colour being due to a thin stratum of vegetable wax. I call it *F. rubra*, sub-v. *pruinosa* (nov. forma)."—Hackel in litt. "These seems to be creeping plants allied to *rubra*."—C. C. Babington.

Also grows at Loch Aline, Westerness.—W. R. Linton.

Athyrium rhœticum. Strome Ferry, 1884.—E. F. Linton. "I think as labelled, *rhœticum*, rather than the typical form."—T. R. Archer Briggs. "Yes."—C. C. Babington. Mr. J. G. Baker passed it without comment.

Nephrodium uliginosum, Newm. Delamere Forest, Cheshire, Aug., 1884.—James Fraser. "Poor and doubtful."—C. C. Babington. "I think only *spinulosa*."—J. G. Baker.

Nephrodium dilalatum, Desv., v. *glandulosum.* Clova, Forfar, 21st July, 1884.—E. F. Linton. "A slightly glandular form of *dilatata*, but not the *glandulosa* of Newman.—J. G. Baker.

Nitella opaca. Old Bedford, Cambridgeshire, 3rd May, 1885. A. Fryer. "As we have remarked in 'Journal of Botany' for March, 1885, this is apparently a monoclinous state of *N. opaca*. We hope to see more of the plant during the coming season."—Messrs. Groves.

Chara vulgaris, L., v. *crassicaulis.* Ellington, Hunts, 3rd May, 1884.—W. R. Linton. "Yes."—Messrs. Groves. I should not name this so, and other specimens I have seen referred to this by the Messrs. Groves do not seem to me to agree with the true plant.

Chara vulgaris, L., v. *longibracteata.* Pinner, Middlesex, July, 1884.—W. R. Linton. "*Chara fragilis*, Desv., v. *Hedwigii*."—Messrs. Groves.

Chara fragilis, Desv., v. *fulcrata.* Staines Common, Middlesex, 28th July, 1883.—W. R. Linton. "*C. fragilis*, Desv. v. *Hedwigii*, par."—Messrs. Groves.

Chara Braunii, Gmel. In the Canal, Reddish, near Manchester. Mr. C. Bailey sends a supply of good specimens of this species, which enabled me to supply all the members.

NEW COUNTY RECORDS.

Fumaria confusa. Holy Island, Northumberland, (Cheviotland), 1884.—H. E. Fox. See page 102.

Thlaspi perfoliatum. Charlbury, Oxon.—G. C. Druce. See p. 102.

Viola Curtisii. Ross Links, Northumberland (Chevt.), 1884. H. E. Fox. See p. 102.

Polygala vulgaris. Bledlow, Bucks, June, 1884.—G. C. Druce.

Cerastium pumilum. N. Somerset.—J. W. White. See p. 103.

Stellaria uliginosa. Buckden, Hunts, 1884.—W. R. Linton.

Hpyericum dubium. H.C.M. Pond, Surrey.—W. H. Beeby. See p. 103.

Althæa officinalis. Charthill, Northumberland.—H. E. Fox. See p. 103.

Vicia gracilis. Wolverton, Oxon, May, 1884.—G. C. Druce.

Sanguisorba officinalis. Surrey.—W. H. Beeby. See p. 103.

Euphrasia officinalis. W. Ross.—E. F. Linton. See p. 109.

Mentha piperita. North Leigh Heath, Oxon, 7th Sept., 1884. G. C. Druce. See p. 109.

Mentha gentilis. Easington, near Belford. Northd.—H. E. Fox. See p. 109.

Anchusa officinalis. Hartlepool, Durham.—H. E. Fox. See p. 109.

Centunculus minimus. Ross Links, Northumberland (Chev.). H. E. Fox. See p. 109.

Rumex maritimus. Northumberland.—H. E. Fox. See p. 109.

Sparganium affine. Uig, Skye, Aug., 1884.—Messrs. Linton. See p. 110.

Sparganium minimum. Newham Lough, Northumberland.—H. E. Fox. See p. 111.

Potamogeton zosterifolius. Salop, 1884.—E. Beckwith. See p. 114.

P. natans. N. Somerset, 1884.—W. B. Waterfall. See p. 112.

P. plantagineus. Hereford, 1884.—A. Ley.

P. decipiens. Surrey, 1884.—W. H. Beeby. See p. 113.

Corallorhiza innata. Chievotland.—H. E. Fox. See p. 115.

Scirpus pauciflorus. Bisley Common, Surrey.—W. H. Beeby. See p. 116.

Carex dioica. Bisley Common, Surrey.—W. H. Beeby. See p. 116.

Carex fulva. Bisley Common, Surrey.—W. H. Beeby. See p. 118.

Carex Œderi. Ross Links, Northumberland.—H. E. Fox. See p. 118.

NOTICE TO MEMBERS.

The duplicates of the 1884 plants remaining over after supplying the contributing members have been made up into sets, and will be supplied to the non-contributing members for 1884, upon application to the Secretary, Mr. Charles Bailey, Ashfield, College Road, Whalley Range, Manchester.

ERRATUM IN REPORT FOR 1883.

Page 89, first line. For *Rubus*, read *Rosa.*